

Next Steps

Main Report Headings

- Executive summary
- Subcommittee members
- Introduction from the chair
- Background and charge to the Subcommittee
- Use of the NPL
- Mega sites
- Measuring program progress
- Other issues and concerns

For all sections

- Increase context and background (including description of current practices/status quo)
- Add discussions of implications of the ranges of views and recommendations
- Most existing recommendations are carried forward in this outline
 - text explaining and further elaborating recommendations will be included (revised based on comments)
 - will be revised based on this meeting
 - will reflect where consensus vs. range of views

Background and Charge

- Add more detail to the description of the Subcommittee's revision to the charge and how the Subcommittee framed the issues before it.

Main Headings Within Recommendation Sections

- Background and context
- Issue / problem statements – topic areas parallel subsequent recommendation sections
- Recommendation
 - Amplifying information
- Recommendation
 - Amplifying information

NPL – Add Background & Context

- Should be true national priorities, but:
- Range of views on what types of risks should be highest priority for the NPL
- Range of views on funding needs/sources
- Range of views on how NPL should be used
 - Only list sites you can fund and implications
 - List all sites w/ a legitimate HRS score of 28.5 and implications
 - Other?
 - Middle road
- Recommendation 1 goes away

NPL – Issue/Problem Statements

1. How to reduce the number of sites needing cleanup?
2. How to make the best listing decisions?
3. How to set priorities when prioritization is needed?
4. How to increase efficiency/resources for the program?
5. How to increase transparency?

1. Reducing the number of sites

- Prevention issues and capacity building (new, currently discussed in text for recommendation 1 p. 10/4-17)
- Other?

2. Making the best listing decisions

- Appropriately involve states, PRPs and communities in listing process
(recommendation 2)
- Use other programs where appropriate
(recommendation 3)
- Improve application of the HRS
(recommendation 4)
- Other HRS recommendations?

3. Setting priorities

- Need to continually evaluate what work is the most important, informally set priorities throughout the pipeline (new)
- Criteria for priority setting at the time of listing (new) (if needed)
- Criteria for setting priorities for fund-lead sites on the list (recommendation 8)
- Recommendation 7 goes away

4. Efficiency / Resources

- Management review with a view toward increasing amount of budget spent on cleanup (recommendation 9)
- Periodic management/operations audits to increase efficiency (recommendation 10)
- Test contracting reforms (recommendation 11)

5. Transparency

- Annual report on out-year liabilities (new)
- Increased communication about what sites are considered for listing, which are listed, and why (recommendation 5)
- Tracking of sites that are sent forward for proposal for listing but not proposed (recommendation 5)
- Improve communication about NFRAP sites (recommendation 6)

Mega Sites

- Increase background and context
 - Issues with defining “mega sites”
 - nature of funding concern (blip or ongoing)
- Issue / problem statement
 1. how to address the funding concern - is there one?
 2. how to manage large, complex sites to most efficiently achieve appropriate cleanups

Definition Issues

- Some sites are very costly and therefore will have significant impacts on the program and because of these impacts warrant special management attention, especially if there are a lot of them
- Difficulty in identifying site characteristics common to mega sites, although some site categories can be described
- Current recommendation 12 goes away
- Other points?

Describing the Funding Concern

- Data reviewed
- Conclusions (blip or ongoing) or range of views
- Implications of conclusion
- Other points?

1. Addressing the Funding Concern

- Present range of views on alternative scenarios/options
 - Send more sites to other programs or import other program money to Superfund
 - Increase revenue for the program from appropriations or Superfund taxes
 - Increase efficiencies in Program spending

2. Special management attention

- Pay attention – put best people on the sites (new)
- More thorough site assessment process (recommendation 13)
- Consider appropriate segmentation (recommendation 14)
- Coordinating mechanisms (recommendation 15)

Key Ideas

- The NPL is for sites that represent significant risks to humans or the environment and are true national priorities for Superfund cleanup.
- More resources should be directed towards cleanup activities. Transaction and program management costs should be optimized to maximize the money available for cleanup (and new sources of funding should be explored/requested)

Key Ideas

- EPA has a responsibility to define the sites that are true national priorities for Superfund cleanup and make listing decisions in a way that is transparent. (Criteria for defining listing priorities)
- At listed sites, choices about what work to emphasize or fund will be needed throughout the process -- there should be clear criteria consistently applied used to make these choices. Addressing actual, current near-term risks to humans is the highest, but not only, priority.

Key Ideas

- There should be a process of continuous improvement to reduce the number of sites that could become Superfund sites in the future through prevention, capacity building, and appropriate use of other cleanup authorities.
- Some sites are disproportionately costly, these affect the program in a significant way and therefore deserve special management attention (and funding approaches).